

M.S



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/494,067	01/28/2000	Rama Murty Kalluri	OPTVP009	3003

20306 7590 10/22/2002

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3200
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

21

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

9

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/2/02

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 25-26 and 33 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 9-11, 14, 17-20, 22-24, 29-32 + 34-36 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-415

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES -

Best Available Copy

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 25, 27, 28 and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasmussen (5,995,146).

As to claim 1, note the Rasmussen reference which discloses a video communications system for transmitting video data between a plurality of transmitting nodes and one or more receiving nodes 60. Particularly, the combiner 70, Figures 1 and 4, receives transport streams from several locations which have been packetized as service data units and arranged for transmission as the payloads of ATM cells. The program information data associated with transport stream cells allow the combiner 70 to determine the source of the picture data and to separate the different MPEG video channels. The cells are thus sorted into appropriate memory locations, and the elementary stream (ES) payloads and necessary header information are extracted. As set forth in Figure 4 and the disclosure of col. 6 lines 29+, the combiner 70 operates such that following de-packetization, the sequence context information reader 74 reads

Art Unit: 2611

the sequence context information which was inserted into the encoded picture data. The sequence context information includes picture size and location information, and other coding parameters (Note the disclosure of col. 6 lines 8-20, which makes clear that prior coding process creates an ES having ES headers with reference display locations and macroblock headers with relative display locations--that is, relative to the header or to prior slices.) The memory 76 stores the encoded picture data for each transport stream, and the context information inserter 78 inserts the appropriate sequence context information into the ordered encoded picture data. The sequence context information is inserted into the ES header 220 for the combined pictures (Figure 5B), and specifies coding information such as frame rate, aspect ratio, size, and display location for the combined picture. The combiner 70 thus carries out the claimed steps of determining..., and interleaving... into a composite video stream.

Rasmussen fails to disclose the claimed modifying the value of the display position code of each slice of the received MPEG-encoded video stream as necessary. It would have been obvious a quick and efficient method for modifying the display position for MPEG slices would have been to modify the display position code of each slice. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rasmussen to include the claimed limitation to provide a quick and efficient means for modifying the display position of slices.

As to claims 2 and 3, MPEG-2 defines MBAI VLCs or SSCs as display position codes. The reference clearly specifies coding using MPEG-2.

Art Unit: 2611

Claim 8 is met by that discussed above.

As to claim 12, the reference does not explicitly disclose an interactive decoder, such as that in communication with a broadcast center in a video distribution network. However, the reference does disclose that the combiner 70, which was disclosed as part of the receiving node 60, could be arranged as a shared network resource which generates a new transport stream and an ATM cell specifying the address(es) of the receiving node(s), col. 6 lines 48-53. This arrangement would be consistent with that used in an interactive video distribution network. Therefore, the Examiner submits that it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the Rasmussen teachings to the interactive video distribution environment to allow for the simultaneous delivery of multiple video sequences to the user without the need for sophisticated or costly picture-in-picture elements.

Claims 13, 15, 16 and 21 are met by that discussed above.

Claims 25, 27, 28 and 33 are met by that discussed above.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 4-7, 9-11, 14, 17-20, 22-24, 29-32 and 34-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2611

4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest MBAI VLCs which contains 3 bits having a corresponding increment value of one of 2 and 3, the modification of the display position code such that a resulting modified MBAI VLC has a modified number of bits (wherein the modified number of bits modulo 8 equals the original number of bits modulo 8, and the modification of the display position code such that a resulting modified MBAI VLC includes a selectively added number of stuffing codes ranging from 0 to 7.

Conclusion

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308- 5399 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Art Unit: 2611

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 4038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andy Faile, can be reached at (703) 305 - 4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 3900.

VS 10/18/02



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PATENT EXAMINER